

## **REMARKS**

### **1. Summary of the *Ex parte Quayle* Action**

The *Ex parte Quayle* Action mailed April 16, 2010 objected to the specification. Specifically, the Examiner objected to informalities related to references of “to be assigned-reference numbers.” *Ex parte Quayle* Action, page 3.

### **2. Summary of the Response**

In response, Applicant has amended the specification as requested by the Examiner to recite an application serial number for each related application previously identified in the specification by attorney-assigned reference numbers. For related issued applications, the specification is amended to recite the corresponding application patent numbers and issue dates.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 20-24, 27-28, 31, 33-38, 46, 50, 52, 53, 57-60, and 64-65 to clarify the language of the claims and/or correct minor errors in the claims. These amendments are generally supported by the application.

This response is filed with an RCE, and Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner consider the concurrently-filed Information Disclosure Statement (IDS).

### **3. Conclusion**

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to consider and enter these amendments. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (312) 913-3338 as needed to expedite prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

**McDONNELL BOEHNEN  
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP**

Date: May 20, 2010

By: /Thomas J. Loos/  
Thomas J. Loos  
Reg. No. 60,161